

42434-A 4

---

---

# REPORT

OF THE

## National Divorce Reform League

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31,

1891.

---

---



# THE National Divorce Reform League.

---

## PRESIDENT :

Rev. ALVAH HOVEY, D. D., LL. D., Newton Centre, Mass.

## VICE-PRESIDENTS :

Hon. NATHANIEL SHIPMAN, LL. D., Hartford, Conn.

Pres. SETH LOW, LL. D., New York.

## CORRESPONDING SECRETARY :

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL. D., Auburndale, Mass.

## RECORDING SECRETARY :

Rev. C. H. SPALDING, 14 Tremont Temple, Boston.

## TREASURER :

WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, Esq., 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE :

Hon. EDMUND H. BENNETT, LL. D., Boston.

Pres. M. H. BUCKHAM, D. D., Burlington, Vt.

GEORGE C. SHATTUCK, M. D., Boston.

Hon. SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D., New Haven, Conn.

Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D. D., Cambridge, Mass.

Prof. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph. D., Newton Centre, Mass.

Prof. GEORGE HARRIS, D. D., Andover, Mass.

Hon. THEODORE W. DWIGHT, LL. D., New York.

Rev. JAMES DENORMANDIE, Roxbury, Mass.

Pres. G. D. B. PEPPER, D. D., Waterville, Me.

Hon. HAMILTON ANDREWS HILL, Boston.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL. D., Auburndale, Mass.

# REPORT

OF THE

## National Divorce Reform League

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1891.

---

BOSTON:

PRINTED BY C. H. SIMONDS & CO.,

47 FRANKLIN STREET.

## CONTENTS.

OFFICERS, . . . . .	See cover, Page 2
CONSTITUTION AND FORM OF BEQUEST,	See cover, " 3
INTRODUCTORY NOTES, . . . . .	" 3
MINUTES OF ANNUAL MEETING, . . . . .	" 5
REPORT OF CORRESPONDING SECRETARY, . . . . .	" 7
UNIFORM LEGISLATION, . . . . .	" 7
COMMISSIONS OF STATES, . . . . .	" 9
DIVORCE IN SOUTH DAKOTA, . . . . .	" 12
LEGISLATION OF 1891, . . . . .	" 13
GOVERNMENT INVESTIGATION, . . . . .	" 16
EDUCATIONAL WORK, . . . . .	" 19
LITERATURE OF 1891, . . . . .	" 23
RELIGIOUS USE OF HOME, . . . . .	" 23
CONTRIBUTIONS, . . . . .	" 25



## INTRODUCTORY NOTES.

---

1. COPIES of our Reports for 1886, 1887 and 1890 can be supplied on application to the Corresponding Secretary at AUBURN-DALE, MASS. A few copies of the paper on Uniform Legislation, to which reference is made on page 10 of this Report, are still on hand; and also a very few copies of the Report for 1889 can be furnished to public libraries. A few of our other papers are in print.

2. The revised edition of the Report of Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe, is nearly exhausted. For the probability of another edition, see page 16 of this Report.

But our own reprint of the fundamental table of the official report, showing the divorces in each State and Territory by years for the period 1867-1886, can be sent to any who apply for it. This also contains a summary of other facts, including divorces in foreign countries. Having been printed from the advance sheets of the government report, it contains two or three errors in its comparison of cities and States. But they are of little consequence.

3. Attention is invited to the necessity for some endowment of the League. There is an evident need of generous provision for the development of its work in several directions. It is the only society of the kind in the country, and its broad aims and careful work seem to ensure a future as long as the American Home needs protection and improvement. A form of bequest is printed on the third page of the cover. But it is hoped that some large gifts may be made by living donors for a permanent fund.

4. We gratefully acknowledge the generous contributions of our old friends, most of which have been continued from year to year, and earnestly invite their renewal. *Money sent without personal solicitation, and as early in the year as possible, is particularly welcome and useful. It is desirable that the time of the Corresponding Secretary should not be taken for the work of collecting funds.*

5. Churches and Individuals are respectfully asked to make a place for the Family and Home in their annual charities. All

other charities and every social institution will be strengthened by our work for the Home.

6. Special attention is called to the privilege of ASSOCIATE ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP, which is fully extended to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of *five dollars* for the year, to be renewed at the pleasure of the subscriber. Such members are for the time members in full, entitled to vote at our meetings and receive all our publications. *If you are not a larger contributor, will you not send your request for associate membership and the fee to the Treasurer at once, and thus give substantial aid to this most important work?*

7. The Treasurer, WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, 610 ATLANTIC AVENUE, BOSTON, MASS., will gratefully acknowledge all contributions.

8. All correspondence relating to the general work of the League and special inquiries for lectures, literature and information should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, REV. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL. D., AUBURNDALE, MASS.

Contributions may be sent to him, or to the Treasurer as directed above.

## MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING.

---

THE Twelfth Annual Meeting of the NATIONAL DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE was held at 2.30 P. M., Jan. 20, 1892, in the room of Hon. Edmund H. Bennett, LL.D., in the Hemenway Building, Boston. The meeting was called to order by the Recording Secretary. Hamilton A. Hill, Esq., was chosen President pro tem. Prayer was offered by Rev. E. W. Smith, Fall River. A fitting memorial record of the death of the President of the League, Rt. Rev. B. H. Paddock, D.D., prepared by Prof. George Harris, of Andover, was read by W. G. Benedict, Esq. It was voted that this memorial be spread upon the minutes of the League and a copy be sent to the family of Bishop Paddock. This vote was taken by all the members rising. The memorial was as follows:

Bishop Paddock was one of the organizers of the NATIONAL DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE, a member of its Executive Committee from the beginning, and its President since 1883, when Dr. Woolsey resigned. Among the many pressing duties of his Episcopate, he made time to attend regularly the meetings of the Committee and of the League. He regarded this reform as of the highest social and religious importance, and rendered valuable assistance by his counsels and influence. The League places on record its high estimation of his services and directs that this minute be published in connection with the annual report of the Society and a copy sent to his family.

The Recording Secretary read the call of the meeting and the minutes of the last annual meeting. The names of the following gentlemen were proposed for membership:

Rt. Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D., Boston.

Hon. R. H. Dana, Cambridge.

Pres. E. B. Andrews, D.D., LL.D., Providence, R. I.

Pres. Merrill E. Gates, LL.D., LH.D., Amherst, Mass.

Pres. W. DeWitt Hyde, LL.D., Brunswick, Me.

The report of the Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict, was presented and referred to Hon. Charles C. Burr to be audited.

The Corresponding Secretary, Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D., read



his annual report, which was accepted and referred to Chairman of Executive Committee, Corresponding Secretary and Treasurer for publication.

It was voted that Rev. E. W. Smith, Rev. W. H. Cobb and Hon. C. C. Burr be a committee for the nomination of officers.

The following officers were elected :

*President*, Rev. Alvah Hovey, D.D., LL.D.

*Vice-Presidents*, Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D. ; Pres. Seth Low, LL.D.

*Corresponding Secretary*, Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D.

*Recording Secretary*, Rev. C. H. Spalding.

*Treasurer*, William G. Benedict, Esq.

*Executive Committee*, Hon. Edmund H. Bennett, LL.D. ; Pres. M. H. Buckham, D.D. ; George C. Shattuck, M.D. ; Prof. S. E. Baldwin, LL.D. ; Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D. ; Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D. ; Prof. George Harris, D.D. ; Hon. T. W. Dwight, LL.D. ; Rev. James DeNormandie ; Rev. G. D. B. Pepper, D. D., LL.D. ; Hon. Hamilton A. Hill ; Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D.

Voted that the Corresponding Secretary inform the National Unitarian Association, in answer to its resolution, that women are eligible to membership and office in the League.

After reading the minutes by the Secretary the meeting adjourned.

C. H. SPALDING, *Recording Secretary*.



# REPORT

## OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

---

THE work of the League is now widely and most favorably known in foreign countries, as well as throughout the United States. Correspondence and other information show the interest taken in it during the last year in England, Scotland, Germany, Belgium, France, Australia and Japan. A leading missionary in Japan recently said, "Your work in America on the problems of the Family and Sociology aids us as much as it does the American people. It shows the Japanese that you are awake to the defects of your own civilization, and it is a direct attempt at the solution of social problems that profoundly concern us of both nations. Lectures on these subjects are greatly needed in our new University."

The Countess Von Krockow, of Berlin, has just published, in the New York *Independent*,\* a remarkable article on Divorce in Germany and America, which has an importance beyond its singularly able presentation of valuable information for those who are not experts in the subject. For it makes clear to general readers some of the many and intricate relations of the problem of Divorce, and points unmistakably to a cardinal position of the League—that the Divorce question, being inseparably connected with that of marriage, leads directly into the larger and inclusive problem of the Family, and that the best work upon its solution must proceed from the study and treatment of the Family.

We take up the narrative of the movement along this line for the year 1891, beginning with an account of efforts in behalf of

### UNIFORM LEGISLATION.

We could only say, a year ago, that a few Governors had just then responded favorably to the request of our Executive Committee that they recommend the creation by their Legislatures of

---

\* Of January 7, 1892.

Commissions to promote Uniform Legislation upon Marriage and Divorce, and on such other subjects as the American Bar Association had added to the list. The State of New York, it will be remembered, had already established a commission which also sent out its invitation in coöperation with the Bar Association and the League. The Hon. Hamilton Andrews Hill, of our own Executive Committee, afterwards informed me that the National Board of Trade had similar aims regarding some subjects of commercial law, and suggested correspondence with the Hon. Levi C. Goodale, of Cincinnati, Chairman of its special Committee on the subject. Mr. Goodale welcomed us most cordially, and has labored earnestly to arouse the Ohio and other Western Legislatures to action, but political affairs and indifference have so far defeated his object. But he is hopeful of the future, and expects the subject will come before the Board at its annual meeting next week in Washington. The special Committee of the Bar Association did good service in several States, and, so far as I know, the success in Michigan was almost wholly due to them. The Chairman of its Committee on Uniformity, the Hon. Lyman D. Brewster, of Danbury, Conn., not only did most efficient work in his own committee, but he and his associates put the League under great obligations by their many services in the work of the year.

The Governors of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi and Washington all wrote in favor of the project, and most of them officially commended it to their Legislatures. An appeal has been made in those States—more than one-third of the whole—whose Legislatures hold their biennial sessions the present winter. Some favorable responses have already come from their Governors. In the States where there were interested members of the Committee of the Bar Association and others to urge the matter, the effort was successful in probably the majority of cases. I was able to go before the legislative committees in Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Pennsylvania. Mr. Leonard A. Jones, of the Committee of the Bar Association, and myself were heard in Massachusetts and supported by a petition of about 40 of the leading citizens of Boston and vicinity, and had no serious difficulty in securing the passage of the measure, which Governor Russell had commended.

In Rhode Island, the Legislature failed to act on either the proposal for a Commission or on a reform bill on the general

subject of marriage and divorce, carrying over, I think, one or both to the next Legislature.

At the request of friends of the measure in Philadelphia I went to Harrisburg, where I found that the Committee had already voted to report adversely. But on a better knowledge of the subject, the vote was reconsidered, the bill favorably reported and passed. In other States, the work of the League was done by correspondence or through others who could better accomplish the object.

#### THE COMMISSIONS.

Six States, containing more than one-fourth the population of the whole country, have now created Commissions, and we may confidently expect others to do so this year. The six are Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Michigan. The names of the Commissioners should be a guaranty of good work.

In Massachusetts, they are the Hon. Edmund H. Bennett, Dean of the Boston University Law School and the Chairman of our own Executive Committee; Mr. Leonard A. Jones, the well-known editor of the *American Law Review* and author of many law books, and Mr. F. J. Stimson, who is the author of *American Statute Law*.

The Commissioners of New York are Hon. Henry I. Beekman, formerly corporation counsel of New York; Mr. Irving Browne of the *Albany Law Journal* and Mr. W. M. Snyder, a law writer who has given much attention to this special subject of conflicting Marriage and Divorce Laws.

In New Jersey, the Commissioners are Hon. Richard Wayne Parker, of Newark; Mr. G. D. W. Vroom, of Trenton, and Mr. Otto Crounse, of Jersey City.

Hon. Thomas F. Bayard heads the Commission in Delaware.

The Governor of Pennsylvania appointed the Hon. Charles R. Buckalew, of Bloomsburg, formerly United States Senator; Mr. Ovid F. Johnson, and Hon. Daniel Agnew, an ex-chief justice of the Supreme Court. Ill-health compelled the latter to decline the service, and Robert E. Monaghan, of West Chester, takes his place.

In Michigan, the Commissioners are Hon. John W. Champlin, of Grand Rapids, recently chief justice of its Supreme Court; Hon.



S. M. Cutcheon, of Detroit, for several terms a member of Congress, and Hon. A. C. Maxwell, of Bay City.

The Report of the Special Committee of the Bar Association on Uniformity is an able and instructive paper. It may be found in the published proceedings of that body for 1891. The Chairman received answers to his inquiries from nearly every State and Territory. The Report says that these show "an almost unanimous verdict in favor of greater uniformity on all the subjects designated, and a substantial agreement of opinion that the desired uniformity can best be secured by legislative action in the various States." Referring to the favorite method of many, that of uniformity through an amendment of the Constitution of the United States, the Committee of the Bar Association speak as follows: "That this method would have the advantage of more complete uniformity, and of permanency, if it were practicable, must be admitted. But the insuperable difficulties in the way of positive national action, at present, are so apparent and have been so clearly set forth by Mr. Snyder of the New York Commission, in his interesting book, and Mr. Dike, the Secretary of the National Divorce Reform League, that this alternative is really out of the question."\* And further on in his report, Judge Brewster says: "And in truth, if national action, at least by way of prohibitory amendments to the Constitution, is finally found to be the true solution of the problem, what better preparation can be suggested, than the concurrent action of the various State Commissions; and who more likely to see the necessity for national action, if it exists, than these very Commissioners?" This opinion, also, has found repeated utterance in the Reports and papers of our League. The Report was adopted heartily and unanimously, both in Committee and by the Bar Association, and the Committee instructed to pursue the work so well begun.

The New York Commissioners have made their first report to the Legislature of that State, in which they say "the Commission is also greatly indebted to the National Divorce Reform League." Their report is, however, necessarily devoted to an account of the steps taken in other States in the same direction, without entering into the heart of the work before it. But it gives a very interesting account of some of the evils that need to be removed.

---

\* For the fullest statement of the latter case by Mr. Dike see the *Arena* for September, 1890, or in a reprint by the League.



Correspondence with members of the Commissions in the six States discloses a general sense of the need of an early meeting of the various Commissions, and I learn that steps are now being taken to bring such a conference about at an early date.

#### THE LIMITATIONS OF LEGISLATION.

Let me note here, what has been repeatedly noticed in these reports, that neither the work of the Commissions or any other work directed chiefly to the problem of uniform legislation, however far it may be extended, can cover more than a part of the great subject of Marriage and Divorce Reform. If it seems superfluous to say this to our own members in our annual meeting, it is not so for some of our readers and others.

For notwithstanding all our care and reiteration for several years, there is still a large number of persons in the country whose first and almost only thought of Divorce Reform implies that it is a matter of legislation chiefly, and especially of uniform statute law; and some still think of the League as a society devoted mainly to Legislative Reform.

Such overlook the facts which have now been officially ascertained under the official investigations we obtained through Congress, which show that 80 per cent. of all the divorces in the United States were granted to parties who had been married in the very States in which they obtained divorce, while a large part of the remaining 20 per cent. cannot be ascribed to the inducements which are offered by our conflicting laws to emigration for easy divorce. A similar care should be exercised in all our estimates of the other evils which actually exist under the lack of uniformity. We justly complain that our conflicting laws disturb marital relations in an unhappily large number of instances, and therefore seek greater uniformity. But the leap to the conclusion that uniform law is the chief need is unwise, though many take it. For it is well to remember that, in spite of all the uncertainties that are possible under our heterogeneous laws, most people who are married or divorced, or who make wills or inherit property, are practically unaffected for good or ill by the conflict of laws. In other words, the problem of uniformity, as we have frequently affirmed, is only a part of the great legislative problem. For one, I must think that the most

important incidental result of the work of the Commissions on Uniformity will be to make this clear. It is certainly very important to the friends of reform that they do not fail to see each part of the legislative problem in its true perspective.

#### DIVORCE IN SOUTH DAKOTA.

An illustration of the ease with which error becomes common is afforded by recent scandals in the new State of South Dakota. Here, as in the old Territory, almost if not quite from the beginning, the legal condition of a residence of 90 days only—which must, however be in good faith—and some other rather loose provisions of law, have always made divorce unusually easy. For several months the newspapers abounded in long articles and editorials on the state of affairs in South Dakota, especially in Sioux Falls and vicinity. It was frequently said that 106 suits were pending on the first of August in this city alone, and that 200—some had it 300—had been decided previously during the year. The old arguments for amendment of the constitution were again brought out by some on the strength of these statements, and one of the Senators has proposed it in Congress. Nobody questioned the substantial correctness of the alleged facts. But, through the courtesy of the court officials, I obtained over their own names a statement of the number of applications for divorce for the twelve months ending September 30, 1891, in the five counties that make up the circuit of Sioux Falls. There were only 65 *applications* for divorce in the five counties in this period of a year. Of these, 47 were applications made in Sioux Falls. My correspondent could examine only 34 of them to ascertain the place where the parties resided or had been married, because the papers of the others were at the time in the hands of attorneys. Out of these 34, no less than ten had been married—if I correctly understand an ambiguous word—in South Dakota, while seven were from New York City, two came from the State of New York and five from Iowa. The others came one and two each from eight States and countries, just as the population has. The rural counties make about the same showing. I regard this worth record here as a fair specimen of the difference between current statements and actual facts. Abuses in South Dakota are serious enough without exaggerations like this to which I have referred.

## THE LEGISLATION OF THE YEAR.

The natural effect of the creation of the Commissions upon Uniformity is to suspend or delay all legislation upon Marriage and Divorce until the Commissions report, and thus enable the several States to make their changes in law in the direction of the plan recommended. With the dangers of excessive and crude legislation there is much to commend in this course. But with all this motive to delay, legislative reform has not been entirely lacking, and some useful laws have been made. But all the changes in Marriage and Divorce laws of any considerable importance will be noted here.

## IN THE WESTERN STATES.

It is a hopeful sign that reform movements have now begun in the extreme West. For it is not true, as some say, that the laxity there is due to Western ideas of progress. The crudities or needs of new settlements have been the chief factor in the problem. California has adopted two checks upon improper divorce. Under the old law requiring only six months' residence in the State before an application could be made for divorce, a considerable number of persons in the East combined the pleasures of travel or of a winter's residence with the business of a divorce suit. The Statute has now raised the term of residence to one year in the State and three months in the county. It has also enacted a law similar to that of Illinois as a protection against the Divorce shyster. This makes it a misdemeanor to advertise or circulate in any form advertisements offering to procure divorces.

In Oregon, a vigorous paper was read before the State Bar Association upon the evils of its numerous divorces and the need of legal reform. An able committee has been appointed to study the matter and propose measures for reform to the Association. The friends of the movement express a desire to come into coöperation with the Eastern advocates of Uniform Legislation.

A similar discussion has lately occurred in the Bar Association of Denver regarding the prevalence of divorce in Colorado, and I think steps like those in Oregon are to be taken. The leading newspapers of Denver have repeatedly urged the need of some relief from the condition of things under present law and practice.



The official Report of Indiana says, "From whatever point of observation the subject of divorce is viewed, it is fruitful of convictions that laws more severely discriminating in matters of marriage and divorce are required in Indiana."

The new State of Washington has amended its territorial law, but apparently without the change of any essential feature. Washington, Kentucky and Rhode Island are now the only States that retain the principle of the old notorious "omnibus clause" of Connecticut, which by the discretion granted to the courts expressly provides for divorce on the most flimsy grounds, and which has been discarded in later years there and in several other States.

Ohio has found it necessary to provide by law that "a Divorce or Judgment for Alimony shall not be granted upon the testimony or admission of a party unsupported by other testimony, nor shall any admission be received which the court has reason to believe has been obtained by fraud, connivance or other improper means, but the parties shall, notwithstanding their marital relations, be competent to testify in actions and proceedings under this chapter as fully and to the same extent that any other witness might."

Tennessee requires all male citizens who bring suits for divorce to give bonds and security for the costs of the same, and Alabama provides for the restitution and distribution of property after a divorce.

Delaware has a new law which provides that "No Divorce from the bonds of matrimony shall be decreed by the court when the cause assigned therefor in the petition occurred out of this State and the petitioner was a non-resident thereof at the time of its occurrence, unless for the same or like cause such divorce would be allowed by the laws of the State or country in which it is alleged to have occurred." This, for example, closes the courts of Delaware to all parties from New York except those who may allege the one cause allowed in the latter State. Its principle covers some of the most serious cases under our conflicting laws, and exemplifies interstate comity.

This account shows that the year 1891 has been an advance on former years in improved legislation; and, as in nearly all recent years, nothing has been done in the direction of looseness. This, with the steps taken in the West, and the powerful movement for concurrent legislation by the States and Territories, give us strong incentives to press on the work of legislative reform. The spontaneity of some of these steps, so far as any direct suggestion



from the League is concerned, is a good indication of the growth of a wholesome public opinion.

#### MARRIAGE LAWS OF THE YEAR.

These are few and comparatively unimportant, though the need here is quite as great as it is in Divorce law. Alabama legalized the marriages celebrated by ministers whose credentials had not been recorded according to the previous requirements of law. Illinois declares valid marriages where one or both of the parties were slaves at the time of marriage. North Dakota fixes the marriageable age at 18 and 16 years, and Texas amends the law in order to define more exactly those entitled to celebrate marriage.

While I have not noted, during the year, the success in any State of attempts to raise the "age of consent," as we term an important measure in the interests of the family and good morals, I desire to direct attention to the beginning of an important work in Michigan for the protection of women and children from indecent assault, of which, in that State and elsewhere, there are an alarming number of instances. A woman of the best social standing, and of a thoroughly conservative mind and judicial temperament, becoming aroused at what has been taking place, has enlisted hundreds of women of high character in an effort to improve the laws of the State so that their execution may be certain, and offenders may not escape after conviction, through undue leniency of the judicial and executive authorities. The *Detroit Free Press* has published some valuable letters, and high officials have given the movement their approval; yet the bill failed in the Legislature for want of an able and courageous champion.

As an indication of the need of some work in this direction, the statement is made that no less than twenty-three assaults upon women and children, chiefly the latter, were reported in the newspapers as having occurred in that State in eight months. My attention has been called, with particulars in detail, to the constant danger of insulting speech to which girls are exposed in some schools, and that, too, in rural communities, from loafers and others. The complaints happen to come from two States in the West, and the foreign element there seems to be most implicated. But there can be no doubt that whatever the trend, whether upward or downward, the moralities of sex need greater attention from Christians and

philanthropists in country and city. In the cities, especially, the immoralities of this kind, and improvident marriages, to which, by the way, some carefully collected statistics of the combined charity societies of New York City ascribe 20 per cent. of all their cases, together with the saloons and the bad tenement houses, are the chief sources of poverty and crime. The Family and the House make the Home. But the evil influence of bad dwellings for the poor is certainly matched by the power of a corrupt domestic life to defeat the objects of a good house or tenement. Reform must work at both ends, just as Christianity attends to body and soul. The strong tendency of the study of statistics and the scientific and practical treatment of social evils is to analyze and distribute what are called their causes into several classes, in which the influence of the Family and its moralities comes to the front. While it is true that the saloon, the brothel and the tenement house corrupt domestic life, many have yet to recognize how much the Family has to do with determining how great or how little these corrupt institutions affect the Home. The root of much of our trouble in the study and practical solution of social problems lies in the fact that we have not made a broad and thorough study of the Family and its relation to our social life.

#### INVESTIGATION: THE GOVERNMENT REPORT.

The first edition of the Report of the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, United States Commissioner of Labor, on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe, was exhausted, and the Commissioner printed a second and revised edition, containing, however, only a few and generally unimportant corrections. In reply to my inquiries, the Commissioner writes, under date of Nov. 27, 1891:

“We have been able, so far, to answer all urgent calls for this Report, but cannot supply them much longer, having only about 200 copies on hand. These will last only a very few weeks. As the State Commissioners are appointed, the demand for these Reports will increase, even beyond what it has been, and from our observation here I should say that an edition of ten thousand copies ought to be supplied by Congress at the coming session. As I have informed you verbally, Congress has never yet made any appropriation for printing and binding this Report. All that have



been distributed have been secured at the expense of the appropriation for printing and binding for this Department. We have in this way distributed, excepting the few on hand, 6,750 copies. I shall not be able, with the appropriation for printing and binding for the present fiscal year, that ending June 30, 1892, to make requisition for any further editions. The supply, therefore, must come by Congressional action."

Steps have been taken to have this provision made at the present session of Congress. It should be urged on members of Congress by all interested in the subject.

#### FURTHER INVESTIGATION.

We have called attention, in former Reports, to the considerable mass of unpublished information brought out in the investigation, whose chief results were printed in the Report on Marriage and Divorce already published by the Department of Labor, and to the need of completing the investigation itself along the lines of the original plan. The creation of State Commissioners, and the growing demand that legislation and reformatory work shall proceed on adequate information, render this more necessary than ever. I am happy to say that the Commissioner of Labor has already put into his estimates for the year a sum to enable him to take up this work.

#### AID FROM THE CENSUS.

Some will remember that we have pointed out the great aid the census might have given in determining what proportion of the 20 per cent. of the divorces of the United States, which are obtained in States other than the one in which the marriage took place, belong to those sought by non-residents. Had the population, under the census of 1880, been classified both by conjugal condition and place of birth, instead of the latter alone, Mr. Wright could have shown this. I laid this need before the Superintendent of the present census, and he assures me that this work shall be done for 1890, and perhaps for the previous census from the original schedules. This will enable us to compare, for example, the number of married persons in California who were born in New York with the number divorced in California who had been married in New

York, as the latter fact was brought out in the report of Mr. Wright. In this way a reasonably good estimate can be made of the extent of migration expressly for easy divorce.

#### STATE REGISTRATION REPORTS.

The importance of extending a common system of the registration of marriages and divorces over the country was presented in our Report for 1890. It was especially urged that every license for a second marriage should give the previous conjugal condition, whether single, widowed or divorced, as well as the date and place of the dissolution of the former marriage. The sociological value of these facts would be great; and so would their practical uses in rendering bigamies more difficult, and in settling the vexed question as to the influence of a desire for re-marriage upon the increase of divorces. Connecticut for two years reports the number of divorced persons married each year. In 1889 there were 286 such—135 men and 151 women, which is a little above one-third the number divorced in the year. In 1890 there were 477 divorces granted, or 954 individuals divorced; and there were 350 divorced persons—this year 207 women and 143 men—who married again during the year. An extended induction along this line should be possible. Guesses based on mere observation are untrustworthy guides in legislation or social reform.

A critical study of the Report of Mr. Wright, especially for its light upon the extent to which legislation operates to increase or decrease Divorce, the work of a young man of much promise, and written as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, was published by Columbia College as the first of its series of issues on Social Problems. But though an able work, and founded on much study of Mr. Wright's Report and other documents, it proved less valuable than was expected. A lack of experience in affairs and practical statistics, as in the case of many young writers, gave occasion for serious errors, some of which I felt compelled, by the use that was being made of them, to point out in a letter to the *New York Evening Post* of July 2, 1891. It is probable that the author will make important corrections if this interesting monograph is republished. His main contention, that legislation has less restrictive power than many seem to think, is quite in accord with



the facts. But, for the reasons alluded to, he failed to perceive the very considerable influence it actually does have in controlling Divorce.

#### ADMINISTRATION.

This suggests that more attention should be given to the administration of our Divorce laws. For no small part of their results depends upon the fidelity of judges, the rules and practices of the courts and the moral tone of the Bar. Legislation may reach some of the evils here. But Bar Associations and public-spirited lawyers and other citizens can do a great deal more. A decision, for example, like a recent one by Judge Fenn, of Connecticut, in which apparently the utmost degree of judicial fidelity to all the parties was accompanied by an able opinion setting forth the interests of the State, is a lesson of great value to the people. Or the recently reported ruling of Judge Brown, of Chicago, to the effect that "No hearing will be granted in divorce cases until the defendant, if within the jurisdiction of the court, has been regularly served with summons, and is in court at the time the case is being heard." The notice taken of such decisions as being something remarkable is an indication of our general condition, which is a surprise to the foreign observer.

#### EDUCATIONAL WORK.

As every one who has followed the work of the League knows, we have always put Investigation, Education upon the Family and its incident subjects and in Sociology, together with practical measures for better use of the Home, by the side of all attempts at legislative reform. The great interest in scientific Sociology and in the study of the Family, which now exists in our leading educational institutions, is generally recognized as very largely due to the efforts of the League. We have systematically and persistently labored for this in the conviction that only as we thus touched the great sources of intelligent public opinion, and induced educated men and women to study the social order and its institutions, which the Family and Home pervade as tissue enters into every part of the human body, could we adequately prepare the way for the solution of the many and intricate problems of Marriage and Divorce. We need this to turn the attention of social reformers to the place the Family must

have in their best work. I say this here because a wide reading of articles in the press shows that many very intelligent people are still quite in the dark so far as a knowledge of the breadth of our work goes.

#### LECTURES IN HIGHER INSTITUTIONS.

The Secretary had time the past year to comply with a few requests for lectures in colleges and similar institutions. I recall those given in Princeton University, Amherst College, the theological seminaries at Newton Centre, Mass., and Chester, Pa., the State Normal School at Westfield, and the two training-schools of Christian and Young Men's Christian Association Workers at Springfield. Arrangements were partially made to accept invitations to lecture in several of the largest institutions in the West this winter, but the unexpected decline in contributions, and other work, have so far prevented.

But better than anything I could do personally in a lecture or two is the work now done in institutions visited in former years, and frequently by young men whose attention was turned this way, or by correspondence to these subjects. Some of the more important courses given this season may be mentioned. Pres. Hyde, at Bowdoin College, Maine, gives, as usual, several lectures on the Family; Prof. Tucker, as in former years, is giving nearly a dozen at Andover Theological Seminary, where his lectures on Social Economics are now widely known. Prof. Taylor is also doing considerable, at Hartford Theological Seminary, in the direction of some lectures of mine, which he sought in 1890, on the more scientific treatment of Sociology and the Family. It was a pleasure, at the last annual examinations there, to hear the theological students give a good account of the Family, Village Community, Feudal System and similar social institutions. For all pastors and missionaries need to know about these things. Prof. Levermore gave a dozen Lowell Course lectures on the History of the Family to students and the public in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in Boston. Harvard has courses in Sociology and on the Family under Mr. Edward Cummings. Columbia offers a course in the Ethics of the Family by Prof. J. H. Hyslop, and Dr. Walter F. Willcox lectures in Cornell once a week through the year on some subject connected with the Family. Columbia also had an important course on Soci-



ology by Prof. Giddings, which he probably gave in his own college at Bryn Mawr. Prof. Commons, of Oberlin, also intends to give lectures in Sociology and on the Divorce question, if not the Family, this winter. These and probably many others that should be named mark great progress, for, ten years ago, absolutely nothing of the sort was done anywhere. I wish I could report large attention to the Family in our Colleges for Women. Wellesley does something in Domestic Economy.

#### THE FAMILY IN UNIVERSITY EXTENSION WORK.

These annual reports have repeatedly, in the last half-dozen years, referred to the need of courses of lectures in leading communities, where ministers, and many others interested in social problems, could make up in some degree for the defects of their academic education. Last year our report took up this subject, and explained the public need, especially among women, for such instruction in the fundamental principles of Sociology, the specific study of the social structure and its institutions, and of the Family and those incidents of it that go to make the Home and its offices in society, and treated at considerable length of University Extension in this direction.

Prof. R. G. Moulton, of Cambridge, England, a well-known leader in University Extension, both in England and America, chanced to see these remarks, and immediately procured copies of our Report for Prof. Patrick Geddes, who is in charge of the work of University Extension at Edinboro', in which he teaches Biology and Sociology. I take the liberty to quote from that part of a letter which he wrote me regarding what was said in our Report for 1890 on sociological study and especially upon my opinion founded on experience, that it ought to begin with the study of the more familiar social phenomena about us.

He writes: "That portion of the Report, if you will permit me to say it, would be of great interest as a separate paper to all who care for escaping from the archaic routine of education, and if you have published any such account, or could direct me to such a paper, I should be careful to bring it at once before our University Commissioners, who are at present settling curricula, and to put it in the right hands in the French and other education departments."

Let me quote also from Prof. Geddes' circular regarding the

summer extension work at the University of Edinboro', for its statement of an important educational principle :

"Many teachers are also recognizing that the established method of classical and historical studies—that of proceeding from a past which the pupil has no means of realizing, towards a present which he never reaches at all—must be profoundly altered. This it is proposed to do by help of the principle which, since Lyell, has revolutionized the natural sciences; *for it is through the vivid endeavor to comprehend the present that we are impelled towards the reconstruction and interpretation of the past.*"

This last sentence, which I have italicized, finely states the principle that has shaped much of the work of our League from the first. The use of it as a key to the method of study can hardly fail to make University Extension, in study of social problems, both popular and educationally successful. In reply to repeated invitations, I have given some encouragement to those in charge that I will undertake a little work in University Extension the coming year, chiefly on some of our own lines of investigation. Perhaps other lecturers will enter upon this important class of subjects.

The inquiries by letter for our publications, lists of authorities, suggestions of lines or methods of study that come to the Secretary in a year, are significant. A single week not long ago brought eight of these. One was from a professor in a large college; two from Harvard students; one from a young woman in college; one from the writer of a review article; another from a minister who is making extended special study; another from a librarian, and one from a missionary. This is fairly representative of the classes who apply, though an unusually large number for a single week.

We began to call years ago for a reasonable place for Sociology in Theological study, either in seminary or previous collegiate course. Others have now made it so often that it is familiar. A department of Sociology is said to be open in the Episcopal Divinity School in Philadelphia, and there has been much talk in favor of such arrangements elsewhere. A plea for the sociological education of missionaries, which I made in the *Congregationalist* of Sept. 17, 1891, was commended on the platform at the Annual Meeting of the American Board at Pittsfield, in private letters and other ways. In less than two months a request for aid in beginning such study came from a missionary in Japan. Others now in this country have also sought help. Some benevolent person should provide



for this. For it is easy to see that a knowledge of the fundamental principles of Sociology and of the leading forms of social organization will add much to the equipment of the missionary. One trained in this way will more readily comprehend a strange social order, and more justly solve the practical questions that will come to him in his work.

#### PUBLICATIONS OF THE YEAR.

Prof. Westermarck's work on "The History of Marriage," published by MacMillan, London, is the most important scientific publication of the year. It should be read for its careful discussion of the great questions which Maine, Morgan, Lubbock, Spencer and Starcke have treated. It is eminently judicial in temper, and its tendency is to modify some theories that have of late been widely held.

The periodical literature of the year, touching Marriage and Divorce, has been considerable, especially that in newspapers, but not of exceptional value as a whole. The more significant articles on the various sides of the subject are :

In the *Contemporary Review* of June, 1891, an article by Sir Alfred Stephen, of Sydney, New South Wales, in criticism of Mr. Gladstone on Divorce. The *New Englander* for May, and again in the issue for the present month (Jan., 1892), has articles on Divorce. So also the *Arena* for December and January of this year. The *Westminster* for August discusses Marriage Institutions. "Symposiums" in the New York *Independent* of Jan. 6th and Feb. 5th, 1891, contain several articles. The Saratoga address of the Hon. Carroll D. Wright may be found in *Lend A Hand*, Boston, for November and December, 1891, and in the *Christian Register*, Boston, of Oct. 8th.

The newspaper discussions of the year have far exceeded those of any former year. The more wholesome tone of the press is evident. The article of the Secretary in the *Arena* of September, 1890, on Uniform Legislation has been reprinted by the League and circulated among those interested in this special subject. That part of the Hon. Carroll D. Wright's address which refers to the part taken by the League in securing his investigation, and a paper by the Secretary on the work of the League were also reprinted.

Calls for our Annual Reports and other publications, chiefly

for the use of college libraries and special students, have been unusually frequent. Unfortunately, many of these documents are out of print. Only reports for 1890 can be freely supplied. Copies of 1886, 1887 and a very few of 1889 are still in print.

#### THE RELIGIOUS USE OF THE HOME.

The National Council of Congregational Churches, at its triennial meeting in Minneapolis next October, will have a report brought before it by its Standing Committee on the Divorce Question and the Family. The Committee is especially charged with a study and report on "the latent or imperfectly developed resources of the Family and the Home in the work of the churches." At the last General Association of the Congregational Ministers and Churches of Massachusetts, a singularly spontaneous and general complaint was made in the reports of pastors, alleging a decline in the religious life of the Home. A special committee was appointed to report at the next annual meeting. This action, the steady growth of the Home Department of the Sunday Schools for the better use of the Home in study of the Bible, and the way in which the old-fashioned column devoted to "reading for the fireside" or "Family Circle," is giving place to one or two pages, in which a special editor cares for a Home Department, conducted on something like scientific principles, are hopeful signs for the future. We would not impoverish the Home by making it do the work of church or school or organized industry, for that would take us backward towards barbarism. But we do contend that it has great need of better attention, that it may not itself suffer and imperil the social order through its atrophy. The inventive energies of Church and Social Reform may well take up this work of the better use of the Family and domestic life.

With possibly the exception of His reference to the relation of Church and State in the question about the tribute money, the most direct and positive words of Christ on any social problem, which are on record, are those in which He treated of Divorce and the Family. History shows us how profoundly these have already affected Human Society. But study of present conditions points to much that remains to be done. Historical and Sociological studies are each year making clearer the intimate connection between the institutions of the Family and Property. Every interest, therefore,

of Christianity and the social welfare demands the vigorous prosecution of the kind of work undertaken by the National Divorce Reform League.

The receipts of the first half of the year were in advance of those of any former year in our existence. But the decline in the last quarter with the failure—probably through sickness—of two or three subscriptions that had been pledged, has left us with diminished receipts and a small debt. By the practice of rigid economy and the postponement of engagements at a distance, the avails of the League have fallen only \$46.18 below the actual expenses.

SAMUEL W. DIKE.



# TREASURER'S REPORT.

WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, *Treasurer*,

DR.	In account with the National Divorce Reform League.	CR.
Dec. 31, 1890.		By Travelling Expenses . \$ 293.99
To Balance . . . . \$ 16.84		" Postage . . . . 58.00
Dec. 31, 1891.		" Stationery, etc. . . . 38.93
To Receipts for the year, as per		" Advertising, Express,
memorandum at foot . . 2,558.00		Telegrams, etc. . . . 46.10
		" Printing . . . . 131.00
		" Rent . . . . 50.00
		" On Account of Salary of
		Corresponding Secretary 1,956.82
	<u>\$2,574.84</u>	<u>\$2,574.84</u>

Jan.	1 Pres. Seth Low, LL. D., New York. . . .	\$25.00
	7 Prof. F. G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge . . .	5.00
	9 Rev. C. H. Spalding, Cambridge . . . .	10.00
	12 Rev. G. L. Demarest, D.D., Manchester, N. H.	10.00
	19 Pres. E. M. Gallaudet, LL. D., Washington .	5.00
	20 Lawrence Street Church, Lawrence . . . .	5.00
	22 Rev. W. H. Moore, Hartford, Conn. . . .	5.00
	26 Christ Church, Fitchburg . . . .	6.00
	28 Dr. George C. Shattuck, Boston . . . .	25.00
	28 Hon. Hamilton Andrews Hill, Boston . . .	10.00
	28 Rev. Thos. W. Thompson, Worcester . . . .	5.00
	28 Rt. Rev. H. A. Neeley, D.D., Portland, Me. .	5.00
	28 Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D., Cambridge . .	2.00
	28 Prof. H. E. Parker, D.D., Hanover, N. H. .	5.00
	28 Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H. . .	10.00
	Received in January . . . . .	<u>\$133.00</u>
Feb.	2 Rev. W. S. Smith, Auburndale . . . .	\$10.00
	3 W. O. Grover, Boston . . . .	50.00
	5 Col. Jacob L. Greene, Hartford, Conn. . . .	25.00
	5 Mrs. T. D. Woolsey, New Haven, Conn. . . .	50.00
	5 Miss Susan M. Sturges, Mansfield, O. . . .	10.00
	6 Rev. S. P. Cook, E. Northfield . . . .	5.00
	12 Hon. Richard H. Dana, Cambridge . . . .	10.00
	12 Dr. Edmund T. Eastman, Boston . . . .	1.00
	16 Rev. C. D. Bradlee, D.D., Boston . . . .	5.00
	17 Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y. . . .	10.00
	18 Hon. Wm. E. Dodge, New York . . . .	100.00

18	Hon. C. L. Tomblen, Pepperell	1.00
24	Rev. Ruen Thomas, D.D., Brookline	10.00
25	J. N. Denison, Boston	25.00
26	J. C. Braman, Auburndale	10.00
28	W. G. Benedict, Boston	25.00
28	W. S. Collins, New York	5.00

Received in February . . . . . \$352.00

Mar.	2	Rev. E. W. Smith, Fall River	\$ 5.00
	3	Prof. Edw. H. Griffin, LL. D., Baltimore, Md.	5.00
	5	Hon. Dorman B. Eaton, New York	10.00
	6	Hon. Jos. S. Ropes, Boston	5.00
	7	Prof. W. M. Sloane, Ph. D., Princeton, N. J.	5.00
	7	Trinity Church, New Haven, Conn.	25.00
	10	Robert C. Ogdén, Philadelphia, Pa.	25.00
	10	St. John's Church, Stamford, Conn.	10.00
	11	St. Bartholomew's Church, New York	100.00
	17	Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia	25.00
	17	W. C. Stroud, Philadelphia	10.00
	18	Geo. Burnham, Philadelphia	25.00
	18	Stuart Wood, Philadelphia	25.00
	18	Eugene Delano, Philadelphia	10.00
	18	Wm. Goodell, M. D., Philadelphia	10.00
	19	Church of the Holy Trinity, New York	20.00
	19	First Cong'l Church, Mansfield, O.	5.00
	19	Prof. Wm. Lawrence, Cambridge	15.00
	20	Alexander Brown, Philadelphia, Pa.	20.00
	24	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	5.00
	25	Hon. N. Shipman, LL. D., Hartford, Conn.	25.00
	25	Hon. J. M. Allen, Hartford, Conn.	25.00
	30	Mrs. Wm. Appleton, Boston	20.00

Received in March . . . . . \$425.00

April	3	Pres. W. DeWitt Hyde, D.D., Brunswick, Me.	\$ 5.00
	4	Rev. R. Heber Newton, D.D., New York	25.00
	4	Grace Church, New York	100.00
	6	First Cong'l Church, New Haven, Conn.	15.00
	8	St. James Church, Philadelphia, Pa.	50.00
	9	Rev. W. H. Cobb, Newton Centre	5.00
	15	Prof. Edw. Conant, Randolph, Vt.	10.00
	16	Hon. Jona. A. Lane, Boston	10.00
	26	Edwin Ginn, Winchester	10.00
	16	Shawmut Church, Boston	25.00
	17	Theodore Metcalf, Boston	5.00
	20	Cong'l Club, New York	15.00
	21	Geo. A. Plympton, New York	10.00
	22	Funk & Wagnalls, New York	10.00

	22	"J. H. W.," New York	20.00
	23	Church of the Incarnation, New York	50.00
	23	J. Cleveland Cady, New York	10.00
	23	Rev. A. C. Hodges, Buckland	5.00
	24	Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, New York	25.00
	24	Mrs. Melissa P. Dodge, New York	20.00
	24	Rev. John Tunis, Cambridge	2.00
	27	St. Paul's Church, Boston	50.00
		Received in April	<hr/> \$477.00
May	6	W. W. Lockwood, Detroit, Mich.	\$10.00
	9	Gen. S. C. Armstrong, L.L. D., Hampton, Va.	10.00
	11	Hon. Jeremiah Halsey, Norwich, Conn.	5.00
	12	Rev. F. Goodwin, Hartford, Conn.	20.00
	13	Rev. J. W. Bradin, Hartford, Conn.	5.00
	13	"A Friend," Pomfret, Conn.	1.00
	16	Rev. Arthur Lawrence, Stockbridge	25.00
	18	J. P. Bates, Brookline	10.00
	26	J. N. Bacon, Newton	10.00
	29	Trinity Church, Boston	100.00
	31	James J. Goodwin, New York	25.00
		Received in May	<hr/> \$221.00
June	3	Morris K. Jesup, New York	\$ 5.00
	5	Hon. C. C. Burr, Auburndale	10.00
	6	Prof. Graham Taylor, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	5.00
	9	Samuel D. Warren, Boston	15.00
	13	Rev. Reese F. Alsop, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.	5.00
	15	Rev. H. Fairbanks, Ph.D., St. Johnsbury, Vt.	20.00
	15	Dr. C. A. Peabody, Worcester	10.00
	16	George Knapp, Auburndale	10.00
	25	All Saint's Church, Worcester	10.00
	30	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C.	5.00
		Received in June	<hr/> \$ 95.00
July	13	A. A. Low, Brooklyn, N. Y.	\$25.00
	14	Rev. Thos. H. Angell, Harrisburg, Pa.	5.00
	30	Ephraim Whitman, Worcester	25.00
		Received in July	<hr/> \$ 55.00
Aug.	4	Rev. Joseph Cook, Ticonderoga, N. Y.	\$ 5.00
	30	H. G. Marquand, New York	20.00
		Received in August	<hr/> \$ 25.00
Sept.	7	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester	\$25.00
	7	Rev. J. H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10.00
	14	St. Ann's Church, Lowell	25.00



14	Geo. Ripley, Andover	. . . . .	10.00
18	Friends in Raynham	. . . . .	2.00
21	F. D. Allen, Boston	. . . . .	10.00
22	Asylum Hill Church, Hartford, Conn.	. . . . .	50.00
24	Samuel Johnson, Boston	. . . . .	10.00
26	J. W. Danielson, Providence, R. I.	. . . . .	20.00
29	Prof. W. F. Willcox, Ph.D., Ithaca, N. Y.	. . . . .	5.00
30	Pres. Seth Low, LL.D. New York, (bal. of con.)	. . . . .	25.00

Received in September . . . . . \$192.00

Oct.	12	Joseph H. Gray, Boston	. . . . .	\$ 5.00
	20	Grace Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.	. . . . .	25.00
	21	Rev. C. W. Huntington, Lowell	. . . . .	5.00
	23	E. R. Brown, Dover, N. H.	. . . . .	5.00
	24	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	. . . . .	5.00
	26	Prof. H. W. Farnham, New Haven, Conn.	. . . . .	25.00
	30	George P. Davis, Newton Centre, Mass.	. . . . .	5.00

Received in October . . . . . \$ 75.00

Nov.	2	Hon. Edmund H. Bennett, LL.D., Boston	. . . . .	\$10.00
	3	Rev. E. K. Alden, D.D., Boston	. . . . .	10.00
	5	R. R. McBurney, New York	. . . . .	10.00
	5	Rev. D. L. Furber, D.D., Newton Centre	. . . . .	2.00
	9	Hon. B. Douglas, Middletown, Conn.	. . . . .	10.00
	9	Rev. Augustus Woodbury, D.D., Providence	. . . . .	5.00
	11	First Church, Middletown, Conn.	. . . . .	10.00
	12	Mrs. Maria Upham Drake, Boston	. . . . .	10.00
	13	Phillips Church, South Boston	. . . . .	3.00
	18	Rev. Morgan Dix, D. D., D. C. L., New York	. . . . .	25.00
	18	Rev. Dean E. A. Hoffman, D. D., New York	. . . . .	20.00
	19	Prof. Charles W. Shields, D. D., LL. D., Princeton, N. J.	. . . . .	10.00
	20	Dr. H. C. Houghton, New York	. . . . .	5.00
	20	Hon. Robbins Battell, Norfolk, Conn.	. . . . .	10.00
	20	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, Boston	. . . . .	10.00
	29	Anson P. Stokes, New York	. . . . .	10.00
	30	Hon. Joseph Story Fay, Boston	. . . . .	20.00

Received in November . . . . . \$180.00

Dec.	5	Prof. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL. D., New Haven	. . . . .	\$50.00
	5	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence	. . . . .	10.00
	7	Rev. T. T. Munger, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	. . . . .	5.00
	10	Hon. Felix R. Brunot, Allegheny, Pa.	. . . . .	50.00
	11	W. W. Brown, Portland, Me.	. . . . .	10.00
	12	St. Luke's Church, Philadelphia	. . . . .	25.00
	16	Rev. F. H. Johnson, Andover	. . . . .	10.00

16	Rev. C. Cutler, Auburndale	.	.	.	.	3.00
17	Hon. Henry C. Robinson, Hartford, Conn.	.	.	.	.	5.00
18	A Vermont Lady	.	.	.	.	25.00
19	J. Nicholas Brown, Providence	.	.	.	.	25.00
24	Rev. Horace Dutton, Auburndale	.	.	.	.	5.00
29	W. B. Herrick, Natick	.	.	.	.	5.00
30	Hon. Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale	.	.	.	.	10.00
30	Rev. George A. Gordon, Boston	.	.	.	.	10.00
30	Mrs. Horace Fairbanks, St. Johnsbury, Vt.	.	.	.	.	10.00
31	St. John's Church, Providence	.	.	.	.	25.00
31	Christ Church, Hartford, Conn.	.	.	.	.	20.00
31	C. S. Roberts, Auburndale	.	.	.	.	20.00
31	Charles E. Ranlett, Auburndale	.	.	.	.	5.00
						<hr/>
	Received in December	.	.	.	.	\$328.00
	Total Receipts in 1891	.	.	.	.	\$2,558.00







# CONSTITUTION

## OF THE

# National Divorce Reform League.

---

ARTICLE I. This Association shall be called the NATIONAL DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE.

ART. II. Its object shall be to promote an improvement in public sentiment and legislation in the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number.

ART. IV. The Officers of this Society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which Committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices; to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the first Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the Committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two-thirds of the members present.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL. D., Auburndale, Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, Esq., 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

---

## FORM OF BEQUEST.

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE, a Corporation created by the laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successors or assigns, the sum of.....dollars, the principal [or income as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.

